UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRADLEY PETERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case Number 23-11401 Honorable David M. Lawson Magistrate Judge David R. Grand

JOHN DOW, SGT. JACKSON, A. SEMA, PATRICIA ODETTE, JENNIFER C. HESSON, WILLIAM URICH, CITY OF WOODHAVEN, and STATE OF MICHIGAN

Defendants.	
-------------	--

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Presently before the Court is a report issued on March 22, 2024 by Magistrate Judge David R. Grand under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) addressing the defendants' motion for a temporary restraining order. The defendants sought an order forbidding the plaintiff to have contact with the defendants and barring him from entering the grounds of the Woodhaven City Hall because of various statements indicating that he experienced "suicidal and homicidal" thoughts due to the litigation. Judge Grand held oral argument on the motion on March 21, 2024. During the hearing, he questioned the plaintiff at length about his statements. The plaintiff indicated that he did not intend to convey an intention to harm anyone. Judge Grand cautioned him that future threatening language or conduct could result in additional sanctions. The parties also indicated that they were working toward a resolution of some of the issues in the case. Judge Grand therefore recommended denying the defendants' request for a temporary restraining order at this time.

The deadline for filing objections to the report has passed, and no objections have been filed. The parties' failure to file objections to the report and recommendation waives any further

Case 2:23-cv-11401-DML-DRG ECF No. 49, PageID.671 Filed 04/08/24 Page 2 of 2

right to appeal. Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Tchrs. Loc. 231, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

Likewise, the failure to object to the magistrate judge's report releases the Court from its duty to

independently review the matter. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). However, the Court

agrees with the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the report and recommendation (ECF No. 46) is

ADOPTED and the defendants' motion for a temporary restraining order (ECF No. 36) is

DENIED.

It is further **ORDERED** that the previous order of reference to the assigned magistrate

judge (ECF No. 9) is **CONTINUED**.

s/David M. Lawson

DAVID M. LAWSON

United States District Judge

Dated: April 8, 2024

- 2 -